

Project Investment Justification

State Appellate Courts CMS Replacement

A019001

Administrative Office of the Courts

Contents

1. General Information	2
2. Meeting Pre-Work	2
3. Pre-PIJ/Assessment	3
4. Project	3
5. Schedule	4
6. Impact	5
7. Budget	6
8. Technology	6
9. Security	9
10. Areas of Impact	10
11. Financials	12
12. Project Success	13
13. Conditions	14
14. Engagement Manager Comments	14
15. PIJ Review Checklist	15

1. General Information

PIJ ID: AO19001

PIJ Name: State Appellate Courts CMS Replacement

Account: Administrative Office of the Courts

Business Unit Requesting: Arizona Supreme Court

Sponsor: Robert Brutinel

Sponsor Title: Vice Chief Justice

Sponsor Email: rbrutinel@courts.az.gov

Sponsor Phone: (602) 452-3090

2. MEETING PRE-WORK

2.1 What is the operational issue or business need that the Agency is trying to solve? (i.e....current process is manual, which increases resource time/costs to the State/Agency, and leads to errors...):

Appellamation is a comprehensive, appellate court case and financial management system developed specifically for the Arizona Supreme Court and both divisions of the Court of Appeals. This custom automation system, over 20 years old, employs a unique information architecture reliant on an Informix database with equally outdated application software driving the user interface. Its design, security level, user interface, and support model reflect the era in which its development occurred. While it has continued to be enhanced to meet user expectations, enable electronic filing, and also integrated with statewide trial court CMSs (Case Management Systems) to accept transfers of case information on appeal, the end-of-life application suffers from an overly-complex user interface and must be ported to new technology or replaced by a vendor-supported package.

2.2 How will solving this issue or addressing this need benefit the State or the Agency?

Appellamation has reached the end of its useful lifecycle. As automation systems age, the cost of maintaining them increases dramatically. Custom-developed systems suffer the additional risk of losing their development staff to retirement over time. Technical support for the tools used to develop and enhance the software also falls into obsolescence. Obtaining a new COTS (Commercial Off-The-Shelf) product based on newer, vendor-supported technology will vastly reduce support costs and complexity of operations while improving overall security. Replacement will allow the elimination of various out-of-support technologies being maintained by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) solely for the operation of the last-generation CMS (Case Management System).

2.3 Describe the proposed solution to this business need.

A multi-year evaluation of possible technology modernization approaches, tools, and vendor options led to a review of systems operating in other states followed by the creation of an RFP (Request for Proposal) to solicit the best available vendor solution. Because Arizona's current technology is extremely customized, a very detailed set of business, technical, and security requirements was contained within the RFP. Each susceptible vendor has been scored on the ability to address the requirements in the proposal and their on-site product demonstration. The selected system is both flexible and highly configurable to address present and future appellate court needs.

2.4 Has the existing technology environment, into which the proposed solution will be implemented, been documented?

Yes

2.4a Please describe the existing technology environment into which the proposed solution will be implemented.

2.5 Have the business requirements been gathered, along with any technology requirements that have been identified?

Yes

2.5a Please explain below why the requirements are not available.

3. PRE-PIJ/ASSESSMENT

3.1 Are you submitting this as a Pre-PIJ in order to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) to evaluate options and select a solution that meets the project requirements?

No

3.1a Is the final Statement of Work (SOW) for the RFP available for review?

3.2 Will you be completing an assessment/Pilot/RFP phase, i.e. an evaluation by a vendor, 3rd party or your agency, of the current state, needs, & desired future state, in order to determine the cost, effort, approach and/or feasibility of a project?

No

3.2a Describe the reason for completing the assessment/pilot/RFP and the expected deliverables.

The proposal evaluation scoring process will surface gaps between business, technical, and security requirements in the RFP and the stated capabilities of the best-fit software. The implementation strategy being pursued ensures that gaps are expressly documented, have appropriate significance ascribed, have action plans for closure, and have associated timelines as well as costs. From these, the project governance body will decide with the vendor realistic release content and development timelines to include gap-closing functionality in the product.

3.2b Provide the estimated cost, if any, to conduct the assessment phase and/or Pilot and/or RFP/solicitation process.

150000

3.2e Based on research to date, provide a high-level cost estimate to implement the final solution.

3350000

4. PROJECT

4.1 Does your agency have a formal project methodology in place?

Yes

4.2 Describe the high level makeup and roles/responsibilities of the Agency, Vendor(s) and other third parties (i.e. agency will do...vendor will do...third party will do).

The court will supply the technology environment and network connectivity needed by the application and database. The vendor will install and configure the system in accordance with the requirements document included in the RFP (Request For Proposal). Over the initial 45 days of the project, the project team will assess the performance of the system against the current functional requirements. Subsequently, the vendor will provide a plan for configuration, conversion, integration, and any required enhancements. The governance team will review and approve the plan which the project team will execute.

4.3 Will a PM be assigned to manage the project, regardless of whether internal or vendor provided?

Yes

4.3a If the PM is credentialed, e.g., PMP, CPM, State certification etc., please provide certification information.

4.4 Is the proposed procurement the result of an RFP solicitation process?

Yes

4.5 Is this project referenced in your agency's Strategic IT Plan?

Yes

5. SCHEDULE

5.1 Is a project plan available that reflects the estimated Start Date and End Date of the project, and the supporting Milestones of the project?

No

5.2 Provide an estimated start and finish date for implementing the proposed solution.

Est. Implementation Start Date

10/1/2018 12:00:00 AM

Est. Implementation End Date

6/30/2021 12:00:00 AM

5.3 How were the start and end dates determined?

Based on funding

5.3a List the expected high level project tasks/milestones of the project, e.g., acquire new web server, develop software interfaces, deploy new application, production go live, and estimate start/finish dates for each, if known.

Milestone / Task	Estimated Start Date	Estimated Finish Date
Secure Vendor Contract	09/15/17	11/30/18
Hire a Court Project Manager	08/24/18	10/01/18
Vendor Scope Finalization	12/03/18	03/29/19
Enterprise Application Configuration and Integration	04/02/19	10/23/20

Data Conversion, Training, Roll Out New Application	10/26/20	06/30/21
--	----------	----------

5.4 Have steps needed to roll-out to all impacted parties been incorporated, e.g. communications, planned outages, deployment plan?

No

5.5 Will any physical infrastructure improvements be required prior to the implementation of the proposed solution. e.g., building reconstruction, cabling, etc.?

No

5.5a Does the PIJ include the facilities costs associated with construction?

5.5b Does the project plan reflect the timeline associated with completing the construction?

6. IMPACT

6.1 Are there any known resource availability conflicts that could impact the project?

No

6.1a Have the identified conflicts been taken into account in the project plan?

6.2 Does your schedule have dependencies on any other projects or procurements?

No

6.2a Please identify the projects or procurements.

6.3 Will the implementation involve major end user view or functionality changes?

Yes

6.4 Will the proposed solution result in a change to a public-facing application or system?

Yes

7. BUDGET

7.1 Is a detailed project budget reflecting all of the up-front/startup costs to implement the project available, e.g, hardware, initial software licenses, training, taxes, P&OS, etc.?

No

7.2 Have the ongoing support costs for sustaining the proposed solution over a 5-year lifecycle, once the project is complete, been determined, e.g., ongoing vendor hosting costs, annual maintenance and support not acquired upfront, etc.?

No

7.3 Have all required funding sources for the project and ongoing support costs been identified?

Yes

7.4 Will the funding for this project expire on a specific date, regardless of project timelines?

Yes

7.5 Will the funding allocated for this project include any contingency, in the event of cost over-runs or potential changes in scope?

Yes

8. TECHNOLOGY

8.1 Please indicate whether a statewide enterprise solution will be used or select the primary reason for not choosing an enterprise solution.

The project is using a statewide enterprise solution

8.2 Will the technology and all required services be acquired off existing State contract(s)?

No

8.3 Will any software be acquired through the current State value-added reseller contract?

No

8.3a Describe how the software was selected below:

8.4 Does the project involve technology that is new and/or unfamiliar to your agency, e.g., software tool never used before, virtualized server environment?

No

8.5 Does your agency have experience with the vendor (if known)?

No

8.6 Does the vendor (if known) have professional experience with similar projects?

Yes

8.7 Does the project involve any coordination across multiple vendors?

No

8.8 Does this project require multiple system interfaces, e.g., APIs, data exchange with other external application systems/agencies or other internal systems/divisions?

Yes

8.9 Have any compatibility issues been identified between the proposed solution and the existing environment, e.g., upgrade to server needed before new COTS solution can be installed?

No

8.9a Describe below the issues that were identified and how they have been/will be resolved, or whether an ADOA-ASET representative should contact you.

8.10 Will a migration/conversion step be required, i.e., data extract, transformation and load?

Yes

8.11 Is this replacing an existing solution?

Yes

8.11a Indicate below when the solution being replaced was originally acquired.

A vendor was engaged in the late 90's but subsequently went out of business. The court took over software development and implemented the current solution in the Year 2000.

8.11b Describe the planned disposition of the existing technology below, e.g., surplus, retired, used as backup, used for another purpose:

The old technology and related infrastructure will be shut down.

8.12 Describe how the agency determined the quantities reflected in the PIJ, e.g., number of hours of P&OS, disk capacity required, number of licenses, etc. for the proposed solution?

Vendor's RFP response.

8.13 Does the proposed solution and associated costs reflect any assumptions regarding projected growth, e.g., more users over time, increases in the amount of data to be stored over 5 years?

Yes

8.14 Does the proposed solution and associated costs include failover and disaster recovery contingencies?

Yes

8.14a Please select why failover and disaster recovery is not included in the proposed solution.

8.15 Will the vendor need to configure the proposed solution for use by your agency?

Yes

8.15a Are the costs associated with that configuration included in the PIJ financials?

Yes

8.16 Will any app dev or customization of the proposed solution be required for the agency to use the project in the current/planned tech environment, e.g. a COTS app that will req custom programming, an agency app that will be entirely custom developed?

No

8.16a Will the customizations inhibit the ability to implement regular product updates, or to move to future versions?

No

8.16b Describe who will be customizing the solution below:

Though business users have agreed to limit custom development to an absolute minimum number of "show-stopper" issues, the vendor will perform software customization and subsequent support/troubleshooting. AOC (Administrative Office of the Courts) application administrators and "super users" will be able to change various configuration settings for the software without vendor assistance.

8.16c Do the resources that will be customizing the application have experience with the technology platform being used, e.g., .NET, Java, Drupal?

Yes

8.16d Please select the application development methodology that will be used:

Agile/Scrum

8.16e Provide an estimate of the amount of customized development required, e.g., 25% for a COTS application, 100% for pure custom development, and describe how that estimate was determined below:

Not quantifiable until all gaps to business requirements are recorded and analyzed.

8.16f Are any/all Professional & Outside Services costs associated with the customized development included in the PIJ financials?

Yes

8.17 Have you determined that this project is in compliance with all applicable statutes, regulations, policies, standards & procedures, incl. those for network, security, platform, software/application &/or data/info found at aset.az.gov/resources/psp?

Yes

8.17a Describe below the compliance issues that were identified and how they have been/will be resolved, or whether an ADOA-ASET representative should contact you:

Product must conform to architecture standards targets approved by Commission on Technology, the highest governance body over technology for the Judicial Branch, chaired by the vice chief justice. The Commission on Technology will also manage any compliance issues that arise in the course of the project.

8.18 Are there other high risk project issues that have not been identified as part of this PIJ?

No

8.18a Please explain all unidentified high risk project issues below:

9. SECURITY

9.1 Will the proposed solution be vendor-hosted?

No

9.1a Please select from the following vendor-hosted options:

9.1b Describe the rationale for selecting the vendor-hosted option below:

9.1c Has the agency been able to confirm the long-term viability of the vendor hosted environment?

9.1d Has the agency addressed contract termination contingencies, e.g., solution ownership, data ownership, application portability, migration plans upon contract/support termination?

9.1e Has a Conceptual Design/Network Diagram been provided and reviewed by ASET-SPR?

9.1f Has the spreadsheet located at <https://aset.az.gov/arizona-baseline-security-controls-excel> already been completed by the vendor and approved by ASET-SPR?

9.2 Will the proposed solution be hosted on-premise in a state agency?

Yes

9.2a Where will the on-premise solution be located:

Agency's data center

9.2b Were vendor-hosted options available and reviewed?

Yes

9.2c Describe the rationale for selecting an on-premise option below:

The Judicial Branch has operated a data center within the State Courts Building to host statewide software applications since 1991. The data center infrastructure provides a private cloud for the judicial branch that securely connects court entities to DPS, MVD, and DES as well as provides Internet access for more than 190 courts, probation offices, and juvenile detention facilities in the state. The data center holds 144 physical and 316 virtual computer systems with over 1200 Microsoft SQL and IBM Informix databases supporting development, test, production, and backup environments for more than 230 software applications using over 588 TB of disk space on 3 separate SAN hosts. The current Appellate CMS application is supported in the data center. Adding necessary environments for the new Appellate CMS application represents only incremental hardware and software costs for the time until the current system's hardware and software are decommissioned.

9.2d Will any data be transmitted into or out of the agency's on-premise environment or the State Data Center?

Yes

9.3 Will any PII, PHI, CGIS, or other Protected Information as defined in the 8110 Statewide Data Classification Policy be transmitted, stored, or processed with this project?

Yes

9.3a Describe below what security infrastructure/controls are/will be put in place to safeguard this data:

Criminal data is protected in accordance with ACJIS (Arizona Criminal Justice Information System) standards. Court user data / PII (Personally Identifiable Information) is protected in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 123 and all judicial branch security standards approved by the Arizona Judicial Council.

10. AREAS OF IMPACT

Application Systems

New Application Development

Database Systems

Database Consolidation/Migration/Extract Transform and Load Data;MS SQL Server

Software

COTS Application Acquisition

Hardware

Hosted Solution (Cloud Implementation)

Security

Telecommunications

Enterprise Solutions

Contract Services/Procurements

11. FINANCIALS

Description	PIJ Category	Cost Type	Fiscal Year Spend	Quantity	Unit Cost	Extended Cost	Tax Rate	Tax	Total Cost
Hardware Environment, Servers	Hardware	Development	1	24	\$13,434	\$322,416	8.6 %	\$27,728	\$350,144
Software Enhancement/Customization	Professional & Outside Services	Development	1	1	\$35,000	\$35,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$35,000
Hardware Environment, Enclosures	Hardware	Development	1	1	\$99,713	\$99,713	8.6 %	\$8,575	\$108,289
Infrastructure-Related Software, SQL Diagnostics	Software	Development	1	9	\$1,414	\$12,726	8.6 %	\$1,094	\$13,820
Infrastructure-Related Software, Windows Lic.	Software	Development	1	192	\$193	\$37,056	8.6 %	\$3,187	\$40,243
Infrastructure-Related Software, SQL Lic.	Software	Development	1	16	\$12,451	\$199,216	8.6 %	\$17,133	\$216,349
Professional Services (Contract)	Professional & Outside Services	Development	2	1	\$750,000	\$750,000	0.00 %	\$0	\$750,000
Software (Contract Yr 1 deferred & Yr 2)	Software	Development	2	1	\$426,000	\$426,000	8.6 %	\$36,636	\$462,636
Software Enhancement/Customization	Professional & Outside Services	Development	2	1	\$35,677	\$35,677	0.00 %	\$0	\$35,677
Infrastructure Software Maintenance	Software	Operational	2	1	\$2,545	\$2,545	8.6 %	\$219	\$2,764
Infrastructure Software Maintenance	Software	Operational	3	1	\$2,545	\$2,545	8.6 %	\$219	\$2,764
Annual Software Support Fees	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	3	1	\$217,899	\$217,899	8.6 %	\$18,739	\$236,638
Infrastructure Software Maintenance	Software	Operational	4	1	\$43,137	\$43,137	8.6 %	\$3,710	\$46,847
Annual Software Support Fees	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	4	1	\$222,911	\$222,911	8.6 %	\$19,170	\$242,081
Hardware Environment Maintenance	Hardware	Operational	4	1	\$8,400	\$8,400	8.6 %	\$722	\$9,122

Infrastructure Software Maintenance	Software	Operational	5	1	\$43,137	\$43,137	8.6 %	\$3,710	\$46,847
Hardware Environment Maintenance	Hardware	Operational	5	1	\$8,400	\$8,400	8.6 %	\$722	\$9,122
Annual Software Support Fees	License & Maintenance Fees	Operational	5	1	\$228,038	\$228,038	8.6 %	\$19,611	\$247,649

Base Budget (Available)	Base Budget (To Be Req)	Base Budget % of Project
\$0	\$0	0%
APF (Available)	APF (To Be Req)	APF % of Project
\$0	\$0	0%
Other Appropriated (Available)	Other Appropriated (To Be Req)	Other Appropriated % of Project
\$0	\$0	0%
Federal (Available)	Federal (To Be Req)	Federal % of Project
\$0	\$0	0%
Other Non-Appropriated (Available)	Other Non-Appropriated (To Be Req)	Other Non-Appropriated % of Project
\$2,150,000	\$705,992	100%

Total Budget Available	Total Development Cost
\$2,150,000	\$2,012,157
Total Budget To Be Req	Total Operational Cost
\$705,992	\$843,835
Total Budget	Total Cost
\$2,855,992	\$2,855,992

12. PROJECT SUCCESS

Please specify what performance indicator(s) will be referenced in determining the success of the proposed project (e.g. increased productivity, improved customer service, etc.)? (A minimum of one performance indicator must be specified)

Please provide the performance objective as a quantifiable metric for each performance indicator specified.

Note: The performance objective should provide the current performance level, the performance goal, and the time period within which that performance goal is intended to be achieved. You should have an auditable means to measure and take corrective action to address any deviations.

Example: Within 6 months of project completion, the agency would hope to increase "Neighborhood Beautification" program registration by 20% (3,986 registrants) from the current registration count of 19,930 active participants.

Performance Indicators

1) Eliminate Aging Technology by shutting down the Informix and AIX servers as well as eliminating reliance on PowerBuilder Development Environment by June 30, 2021.

2) Implement Replacement Appellate CMS in Production environment by June 30, 2021.

13. CONDITIONS

Conditions for Approval

Should the final costs exceed the estimated costs by 10% or more, or should there be significant changes to the proposed technology, scope of work or implementation schedule, the Agency must amend the PIJ to reflect the changes and submit it to ADOA-ASET for review and approval prior to further expenditure of funds.

14. ENGAGEMENT MANAGER COMMENTS

Project Background

The Arizona Constitution authorizes an administrative director and staff to assist the Chief Justice with administrative duties. Under the direction of the Chief Justice, the administrative director and the staff of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) provide the necessary support for the supervision and administration of all state courts. The AOC Information Technology Division's responsibilities include providing solutions to challenging information technology problems facing the Court. This project will replace the appellate court case and financial management system developed specifically for the Arizona Supreme Court and both divisions of the Court of Appeals. The system is over 20 years old and has reached the end of its useful lifecycle.

Business Justification

Replacing the aging, custom-developed, appellate case management system with a new COTS (Commercial off-the-shelf) product that employs modern, vendor-supported technology will vastly reduce support costs and the complexity of operations while improving overall security. This replacement will also enable the elimination of various out-of-support technologies being maintained solely to operate the current appellate case management system.

Implementation Plan

The vendor will install and configure the system in accordance with the requirements document included in the RFP (Request For Proposal). Over the initial 45 days of the project, the project team will assess the performance of the system against the current functional requirements. Subsequently, the vendor will provide a plan for configuration, conversion, integration, and any required enhancements. The governance team will review and approve the plan and project team will execute it.

Vendor Selection

A multi-year evaluation of possible technology modernization approaches, tools, and vendor options led to a review of systems operating in other states followed by the creation of an RFP (Request for Proposal) to solicit the best available vendor solution. Because Arizona's current technology is extremely customized, a very detailed set of business, technical, and security requirements was contained within the RFP. Each susceptible vendor has been scored on the ability to address the requirements in the proposal and their on-site product demonstration. The selected system is both flexible and highly configurable to address present and future appellate court needs.

Budget or Funding Considerations

This project will be funded by Other Non-Appropriated funds with \$2,150,000 available now and \$705,992.34 to be requested.

15. PIJ REVIEW CHECKLIST

Agency Project Sponsor

Robert M. Brutinel

Agency CIO (or Designee)

Karl Heckart

Agency ISO (or designee)

Richard Blair

OSPB Representative

ASET Engagement Manager

Damon Wellman

ASET SPR Representative

Thomas Considine

Agency SPO Representative

Brett Watson

Agency CFO

Kevin Kluge
